

EXHIBIT 2

1 COOLEY LLP
BOBBY GHAJAR (198719)
2 (bghajar@cooley.com)
COLETTE GHAZARIAN (322235)
3 (cghazarian@cooley.com)
1333 2nd Street, Suite 400
4 Santa Monica, California 90401
Telephone: (310) 883-6400
5 MARK WEINSTEIN (193043)
(mweinstein@cooley.com)
6 KATHLEEN HARTNETT (314267)
(khartnett@cooley.com)
7 JUDD LAUTER (290945)
(jlauter@cooley.com)
8 ELIZABETH L. STAMESHKIN (260865)
(lstameshkin@cooley.com)
9 3175 Hanover Street
10 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000

11 CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP
ANGELA L. DUNNING (212047)
12 (adunning@cgsh.com)
1841 Page Mill Road, Suite 250
13 Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone: (650) 815-4131

14 *[Full Listing on Signature Page]*

15 *Counsel for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19 RICHARD KADREY, *et al.*,

20 Individual and Representative

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
24 corporation;

25 Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS**

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

Admit that You did not compensate Plaintiffs for the inclusion of the content of books they authored in the Datasets used to train Llama Models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 9:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “compensate” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe “compensate” to refer to financial compensation. Meta objects to the Request as compound insofar as it seeks an admission as to multiple datasets used to train Llama Models. Meta further objects on the ground that the term “content of books they authored” is vague, ambiguous, indefinite, undefined, and overbroad in that it is untethered to the allegedly copyright registered works at issue in this Action. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that information about who authored the books at issue in this case is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control. Even reviewing the copyright registration or copyright notice in a book would not tell Meta who “authored” all or any part of the book, because the information may be inaccurate. In this case, authorship is a disputed issue as to at least one at-issue work. Moreover, even where a person is identified as the “author” of a book in a copyright notice or registration, that authorship may not extend to all text in the book (by way of example, content contributed by another author, or previously published or registered works appearing in a collection or anthology, such as a collection of short stories, would not be authored by the copyright holder and are not covered by any copyright in the book, whether registered or not). For purposes of its response below, Meta construes the term “books they authored” as used in this Request to refer to the at-issue books Plaintiffs claim in this case to have authored, without admitting that any Plaintiff was, in fact, the author or owns a valid copyright in the book, and without admitting what any copyright in the book may cover. Meta objects to this Request to the extent it improperly suggests that Meta participated in the selection of the content of books or other content to be included in the datasets used to train the Llama Models or that Meta was required to compensate Plaintiffs to train the Llama Models on any unspecified content of books Plaintiffs authored.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Meta
2 admits that it did not compensate Plaintiffs for the inclusion of the content of books they
3 purportedly authored in the Datasets used to train Llama Models, to the extent those Datasets
4 included the content of books they purportedly authored. Except as expressly admitted, Meta
5 denies the Request.

6 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

7 Admit that You have made Llama 1 available for use by Third Parties.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 10:**

9 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its
10 own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request.

11 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Meta
12 admits that it has made Llama 1 available for use by Third Parties under certain circumstances and
13 subject to certain terms and restrictions. Except as expressly admitted, Meta denies the Request.

14 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

15 Admit that You have made Llama 2 available for use by Third Parties.

16 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

17 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its
18 own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request.

19 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Meta
20 admits that it has made Llama 2 available for use by Third Parties under certain circumstances and
21 subject to certain terms and restrictions. Except as expressly admitted, Meta denies the Request.

22 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

23 Admit that You have made Llama 3 available for use by Third Parties.

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

25 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its
26 own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request.

27 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Meta
28 admits that it has made Llama 3 available for use by Third Parties under certain circumstances and

1 discovery in this case.

2 ***CONFIDENTIAL* AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:**

3 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its
4 own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request, including, in particular
5 Objection No. 4. Meta objects to this Request as improperly seeking discovery on discovery. Meta
6 further objects to this Request to the extent it seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or
7 defenses of any party.

8 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Meta
9 admits that it has not disclosed all Datasets used to train all Llama 4 models because those models
10 remain in development and decisions concerning which Datasets to use for certain versions of the
11 model have not been finalized. Meta admits that it has not disclosed any Datasets used to train
12 Llama 5 because that model has not yet been trained and decisions concerning which Datasets to
13 use have not been made. Except as expressly admitted, Meta denies this Request.

14 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

15 Admit that You used the Books3 database as a Dataset to train one or more Llama Models.

16 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:**

17 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its
18 own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term
19 “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe “Books3 database” to mean the
20 third-party dataset commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request as compound.

21 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Meta
22 admits that it has used most of the third-party dataset commonly known as Books3 as training data
23 to train one or more Llama Models. Except as expressly admitted, Meta denies this Request.

24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:**

25 Admit that the Books3 database contains copyrighted works.

26 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:**

27 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, including its
28 own definitions stated therein, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 45:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Richard Kadrey's work *Aloha from Hell*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 45:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *Aloha from Hell* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 46:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Richard Kadrey's work *The Everything Box*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 46:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any

1 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 2 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 3 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 4 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 6 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 7 commercially-available version of *The Everything Box* is included in the third party Books3
 8 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 9 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it..

10 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 47:**

11 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Richard Kadrey’s work *Kill the Dead*.

12 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 47:**

13 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 14 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 15 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 16 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 17 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 18 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 19 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 20 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 21 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 22 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 24 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 25 commercially-available version of *Kill the Dead* is included in the third party Books3
 26 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 27 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

28

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 48:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Richard Kadrey's work *The Perdition Score*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 48:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *The Perdition Score* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 49:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Richard Kadrey's work *Sandman Slim*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 49:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any

1 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 2 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 3 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 4 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 6 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 7 commercially-available version of *Sandman Slim* is included in the third party Books3
 8 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 9 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

10 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 50:**

11 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Richard Kadrey’s work *The Wrong Dead*
 12 *Guy*.

13 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 50:**

14 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 15 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 16 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 17 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 18 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 19 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 20 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 21 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 22 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 23 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 25 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 26 commercially-available version of *The Wrong Dead Guy* is included in the third party Books3
 27 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 28 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 51:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Sarah Silverman's work *The Bedwetter*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 51:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *The Bedwetter* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 52:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Christopher Golden's work *Ararat*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 52:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is

1 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 2 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 3 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 5 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 6 commercially-available version of *Ararat* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as
 7 expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request,
 8 and on that basis denies it.

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 53:**

10 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Christopher Golden’s work *Dead*
 11 *Ringers*.

12 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 53:**

13 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 14 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 15 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 16 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 17 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 18 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 19 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 20 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 21 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 22 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 24 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 25 commercially-available version of *Dead Ringers* is included in the third party Books3
 26 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 27 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

28

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 54:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Christopher Golden's work *The Pandora Room*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 54:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *The Pandora Room* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 55:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Christopher Golden's work *Snowblind*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 55:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any

1 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 2 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 3 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 4 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 6 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 7 commercially-available version of *Snowblind* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except
 8 as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this
 9 request, and on that basis denies it.

10 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 56:**

11 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates’s work *The Beautiful*
 12 *Struggle*.

13 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 56:**

14 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 15 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 16 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 17 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 18 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 19 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 20 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 21 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 22 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 23 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 25 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 26 commercially-available version of *The Beautiful Struggle* is included in the third party Books3
 27 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 28 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 57:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates's work *The Water Dancer*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 57:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *The Water Dancer* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 58:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates's work *We Were Eight Years in Power*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 58:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly

1 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 2 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 3 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 4 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 5 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 7 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 8 commercially-available version of *We Were Eight Years in Power* is included in the third party
 9 Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief
 10 as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

11 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 59:**

12 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Junot Díaz’s work *The Brief Wondrous*
 13 *Life of Oscar Wao*.

14 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 59:**

15 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 16 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 17 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 18 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 19 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 20 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 21 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 22 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 23 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 24 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 26 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 27 commercially-available version of *The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao* is included in the third
 28 party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a

1 belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

2 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 60:**

3 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Junot Díaz’s work *Drown*.

4 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 60:**

5 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
6 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
7 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
8 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
9 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
10 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
11 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
12 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
13 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
14 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

15 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
16 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
17 commercially-available version of *Drown* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as
18 expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request,
19 and on that basis denies it.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 61:**

21 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer’s work *The*
22 *Confessions of Max Tivoli*.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 61:**

24 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
25 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
26 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
27 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
28 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly

1 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 2 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 3 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 4 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 5 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 7 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 8 commercially-available version of *The Confessions of Max Tivoli* is included in the third party
 9 Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief
 10 as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

11 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 62:**

12 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer’s work *How It Was*
 13 *For Me*.

14 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 62:**

15 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 16 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 17 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 18 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 19 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 20 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 21 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 22 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 23 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 24 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 26 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 27 commercially-available version of *How It Was For Me* is included in the third party Books3
 28 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the

1 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

2 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 63:**

3 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer’s work *Less*.

4 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 63:**

5 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
6 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
7 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
8 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
9 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
10 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
11 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
12 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
13 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
14 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

15 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
16 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
17 commercially-available version of *Less* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as
18 expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request,
19 and on that basis denies it.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 64:**

21 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer’s work *The Path of*
22 *Minor Planets*.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 64:**

24 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
25 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
26 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
27 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
28 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly

1 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 2 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 3 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 4 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 5 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 7 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 8 commercially-available version of *The Path of Minor Planets* is included in the third party Books3
 9 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 10 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

11 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 65:**

12 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff David Henry Hwang’s work *Golden*
 13 *Child*.

14 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 65:**

15 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 16 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 17 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 18 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 19 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 20 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 21 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 22 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 23 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 24 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 26 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 27 commercially-available version of *Golden Child* is included in the third party Books3
 28 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the

1 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

2 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 66:**

3 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff David Henry Hwang's work *M. Butterfly*.

4 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 66:**

5 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
6 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and
7 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and
8 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
9 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
10 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
11 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
12 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
13 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
14 work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

15 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
16 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
17 commercially-available version of *M. Butterfly* is included in the third party Books3
18 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
19 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 67:**

21 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff David Henry Hwang's work *Trying to*
22 *Find Chinatown*.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 67:**

24 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
25 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and
26 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and
27 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
28 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly

1 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 2 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 3 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 4 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 5 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 7 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 8 commercially-available version of *Trying to Find Chinatown* is included in the third party Books3
 9 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 10 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

11 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 68:**

12 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Matthew Klam’s work *Sam the Cat*.

13 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 68:**

14 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 15 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 16 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 17 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 18 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 19 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 20 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 21 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 22 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 23 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 25 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 26 commercially-available version of *Sam the Cat* is included in the third party Books3
 27 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 28 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 69:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Matthew Klam's work *Who is Rich?*

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 69:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta's possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *Who is Rich?* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 70:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Laura Lippman's work *After I'm Gone*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 70:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term "contains" as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term "Books3 database" as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is

1 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 2 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 3 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 5 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 6 commercially-available version of *After I’m Gone* is included in the third party Books3
 7 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 8 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 71:**

10 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Laura Lippman’s work *In a Strange City*.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 71:**

12 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 13 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 14 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 15 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 16 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 17 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 18 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 19 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 20 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 21 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 23 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 24 commercially-available version of *In a Strange City* is included in the third party Books3
 25 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 26 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

27 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 72:**

28 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Laura Lippman’s work *Lady in the Lake*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 72:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *Lady in the Lake* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 73:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Laura Lippman’s work *Sunburn*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 73:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced

1 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

2 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
3 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
4 commercially-available version of *Sunburn* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except
5 as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this
6 request, and on that basis denies it.

7 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 74:**

8 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Laura Lippman’s work *What the Dead*
9 *Know*.

10 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 74:**

11 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
12 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
13 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
14 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
15 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
16 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
17 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
18 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
19 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
20 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

21 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
22 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
23 commercially-available version of *What the Dead Know* is included in the third party Books3
24 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
25 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

26 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 75:**

27 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Laura Lippman’s work *Wilde Lake*.
28

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 75:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *Wilde Lake* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 76:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder’s work *No Visible Bruises: What We Don’t Know About Domestic Violence Can Kill Us*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 76:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this

1 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
2 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
4 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
5 commercially-available version of *No Visible Bruises: What We Don’t Know About Domestic*
6 *Violence Can Kill Us* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted,
7 Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis
8 denies it.

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 77:**

10 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst’s work *Embraced*.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 77:**

12 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
13 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
14 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
15 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
16 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
17 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
18 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
19 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
20 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
21 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
23 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
24 commercially-available version of *Embraced* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except
25 as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this
26 request, and on that basis denies it.

27 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 78:**

28 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst’s work *Unglued*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 78:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *Unglued* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 79:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst’s work *Made to Crave Devotional*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 79:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this

Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *Made to Crave Devotional* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 80:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *After Tupac & D Foster*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 80:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *After Tupac & D Foster* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 81:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Another*

1 *Brooklyn.*

2 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 81:**

3 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 4 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 5 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 6 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 7 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 8 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 9 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 10 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 11 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 12 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 14 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 15 commercially-available version of *Another Brooklyn* is included in the third party Books3
 16 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 17 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

18 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 82:**

19 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Behind You*.

20 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 82:**

21 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 22 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 23 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 24 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 25 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 26 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 27 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 28 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this

1 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
2 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
4 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
5 commercially-available version of *Behind You* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except
6 as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this
7 request, and on that basis denies it.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 83:**

9 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Beneath a*
10 *Meth Moon*.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 83:**

12 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
13 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
14 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
15 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
16 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
17 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
18 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
19 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
20 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
21 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
23 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
24 commercially-available version of *Beneath a Meth Moon* is included in the third party Books3
25 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
26 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

27 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 84:**

28 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Brown Girl*

1 *Dreaming*.

2 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 84:**

3 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 4 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 5 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 6 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 7 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 8 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 9 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 10 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
 11 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
 12 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 14 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 15 commercially-available version of *Brown Girl Dreaming* is included in the third party Books3
 16 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
 17 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

18 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 85:**

19 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Feathers*.

20 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 85:**

21 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 22 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
 23 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
 24 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
 25 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
 26 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
 27 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
 28 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this

1 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
2 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
4 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
5 commercially-available version of *Feathers* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except
6 as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this
7 request, and on that basis denies it.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 86:**

9 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Harbor Me*.

10 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 86:**

11 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
12 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
13 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
14 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
15 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
16 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
17 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
18 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
19 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
20 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

21 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
22 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
23 commercially-available version of *Harbor Me* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except
24 as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this
25 request, and on that basis denies it.

26 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 87:**

27 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *If You Come*
28 *Softly*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 87:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and commercially-available version of *If You Come Softly* is included in the third party Books3 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 88:

Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Miracle’s Boys*.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 88:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create, commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this

1 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
2 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
4 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
5 commercially-available version of *Miracle’s Boys* is included in the third party Books3
6 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
7 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it..

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 89:**

9 Admit that the Books3 database contains Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson’s work *Red at the*
10 *Bone*.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 89:**

12 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
13 applicable to this Request. Meta objects to the term “contains” as vague and ambiguous and
14 unintelligible in the context of this RFA. Meta objects to the term “Books3 database” as vague and
15 ambiguous. Meta will construe this term to mean the third party dataset that Meta did not create,
16 commonly known as Books3. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly
17 burdensome for Meta to determine whether the books3 dataset contains the entirety of any
18 particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis of a third party database that is
19 equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular work. Meta further object to this
20 Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author in fact authored the referenced
21 work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
23 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
24 commercially-available version of *Red at the Bone* is included in the third party Books3
25 dataset. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the
26 truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

1 Dated: January 17, 2025

COOLEY LLP

2
3 By: /s/Judd Lauter

Bobby Ghajar
Mark Weinstein
Kathleen Hartnett
Judd Lauter
Liz Stameshkin
Colette Ghazarian

4
5
6 *Full Counsel List*

CLEARY GOTTLLIEB STEEN &
HAMILTON LLP
Angela L. Dunning

7 COOLEY LLP
8 PHILLIP MORTON (*pro hac vice*)
(pmorton@cooley.com)
9 COLE A. POPPELL (*pro hac vice*)
(cpoppell@cooley.com)
10 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004-2400
11 Telephone: (202) 842-7800

Attorneys for Defendant
META PLATFORMS, INC.

12 COOLEY LLP
13 MATTHEW BRIGHAM (191428)
(mbrigham@cooley.com)
14 JUAN PABLO GONZALEZ (334470)
(jgonzalez@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
15 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000

SERVICE LIST

Joseph R. Saveri
 Cadio Zirpoli
 Christopher K.L. Young
 Holden Benon
 Louis Andrew Kessler
 Aaron Cera
 Margaux Poueymirou
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1000
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
lkessler@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick
MATTHEW BUTTERICK,
ATTORNEY AT LAW
 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, #406
 Los Angeles, CA 90027
 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

*Attorneys for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

Bryan L. Clobes (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Alexander J. Sweatman (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Mohammed Rathur
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
 & SPRENGEL LLP**
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Attorneys for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

Joshua I. Schiller, Esq.
 Maxwell Vaughn Pritt, Esq.
BOIES SCHILLE FLEXNER
 44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Email: jischiller@bsfllp.com
mpritt@bsfllp.com

David Boise, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER
 333 Main Street
 Armonk, NY 10504
 Email: dboies@bsfllp.com

Jesse Panuccio (admitted *pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER
 1401 New York Ave. NW
 Washington, DC 20005
 Email: jpanuccio@bsfllp.com

*Attorneys for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

Brian O'Mara
DiCELLO LEVITT LLP
 4747 Executive Drive, Suite 240
 San Diego, CA 92121
 Email: BrianO@dicellolevitt.com

Amy Keller (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 James A. Ulwick (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Nada Djordjevic (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DiCELLO LEVITT LLP
 10 North Dearborn St., Sixth Floor
 Chicago, IL 60602
 Email: akeller@dicellolevitt.com
julwick@dicellolevitt.com
ndjordjevic@dicellolevitt.com

David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DiCELLO LEVITT LLP
 485 Lexington Avenue, Suite 1001
 New York, NY 10017
 Email: dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst

1 Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq.
2 Daniel M. Hutchinson, Esq.
3 Reilly T. Stoler, Esq.
4 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
5 **BERNSTEIN, LLP**
6 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
Telephone: (415) 956-1000
Email: ecabraser@lchb.com
dhutchinson@lchb.com
rstoler@lchb.com

7 Rachel Geman
8 **LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &**
9 **BERNSTEIN, LLP**
10 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
New York, New York 10013-1413
Telephone: (212) 355-9500
Email: rgeman@lchb.com

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff *Christopher Farnsworth*
12 *and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed*
13 *Class*

Nancy Evelyn Wolff
COWAN DEBAETS ABRAHAMS &
SHEPPARD LLP
9454 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 901
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Telephone: (310) 340-6334
Fax: (310) 492-4394
Email: NWolff@cdas.com

Scott J. Sholder
CeCe M. Cole
COWAN DEBAETS ABRAHAMS &
SHEPPARD LLP
60 Broad Street, 30th Floor
New York, New York 10004
Telephone: (212) 974-7474
Email: ssholder@cdas.com
ccole@cdas.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff *Christopher Farnsworth*
and Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed
Class

1 COOLEY LLP
BOBBY GHAJAR (198719)
2 (bghajar@cooley.com)
TERESA MICHAUD (296329)
3 (tmichaud@cooley.com)
COLETTE GHAZARIAN (322235)
4 (cghazarian@cooley.com)
1333 2nd Street, Suite 400
5 Santa Monica, California 90401
Telephone: (310) 883-6400
6
MARK WEINSTEIN (193043)
7 (mweinstein@cooley.com)
KATHLEEN HARTNETT (314267)
8 (khartnett@cooley.com)
JUDD LAUTER (290945)
9 (jlauter@cooley.com)
ELIZABETH L. STAMESHKIN (260865)
10 (lstameshkin@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
11 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000

12 CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP
ANGELA L. DUNNING (212047)
13 (adunning@cgsh.com)
1841 Page Mill Road, Suite 250
14 Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone: (650) 815-4131

15 *[Full Listing on Signature Page]*

16 *Counsel for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

20 RICHARD KADREY, *et al.*,
21 Individual and Representative
22 Plaintiffs,
23 v.
24 META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
corporation;
25 Defendant.
26

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS**

1 **5.** Meta objects to Instruction Nos. 8 and 9 as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the
2 extent that they purport to require more of Meta than any obligation imposed by law.

3 **6.** Meta objects to Instruction 10 as overbroad and unduly burdensome to the extent
4 that it purports to require more of Meta than any obligation imposed by law. Meta also objects to
5 this instruction on the ground that it improperly demands narrative responses, which are the proper
6 subject not of requests for admissions but of interrogatories, and thereby seeks to circumvent the
7 interrogatory limit.

8 **III. AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**
9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 90:**

10 Admit that *Blood Oath* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in a dataset used to train
11 Your large language models.

12 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 90:**

13 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
14 applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague,
15 ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to
16 the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models (“LLMs”) that
17 were not publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of
18 Plaintiffs’ allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean
19 the models within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta,
20 namely, Llama 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5.

21 Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to
22 determine whether the datasets used to train Meta’s large language models (as construed above)
23 contain the entirety of the text of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis
24 of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular
25 work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author
26 in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or
27 control.

28

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 2 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 3 commercially-available version of *Blood Oath* is included in a dataset used to train Meta’s large
 4 language models, as that term is construed above. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks
 5 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

6 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 91:**

7 Admit that *The President’s Vampire* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in a dataset
 8 used to train Your large language models.

9 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 91:**

10 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
 11 applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague,
 12 ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to
 13 the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not
 14 publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’
 15 allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models
 16 within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama
 17 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5.

18 Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to
 19 determine whether the datasets used to train Meta’s large language models (as construed above)
 20 contain the entirety of the text of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis
 21 of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular
 22 work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author
 23 in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or
 24 control.

25 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
 26 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
 27 commercially-available version of *The President’s Vampire* is included in a dataset used to train
 28 Meta’s large language models, as that term is construed above. Except as expressly admitted, Meta

1 lacks information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies
2 it.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 92:**

4 Admit that *Red, White, and Blood* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in a dataset used
5 to train Your large language models.

6 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 92:**

7 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
8 applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague,
9 ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to
10 the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not
11 publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’
12 allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes “large language models” to mean the models within
13 the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama 1, Llama
14 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground
15 that the referenced work, *Red, White, and Blood*, is not alleged to be at issue in this action.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 93:**

17 Admit that *The Burning Men: A Nathaniel Cade Story* by Christopher Farnsworth was
18 included in a dataset used to train Your large language models.

19 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 93:**

20 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
21 applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague,
22 ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to
23 the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not
24 publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’
25 allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models
26 within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama
27 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5. Meta further objects to this Request on
28

1 the ground that the referenced work, *The Burning Men: A Nathaniel Cade Story* is not alleged to
2 be at issue in this action.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 94:**

4 Admit that *The Eternal World* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in a dataset used to
5 train Your large language models.

6 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 94:**

7 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
8 applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague,
9 ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to
10 the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not
11 publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’
12 allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models
13 within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama
14 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5.

15 Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to
16 determine whether the datasets used to train Meta’s large language models (as construed above)
17 contain the entirety of the text of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis
18 of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular
19 work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author
20 in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or
21 control.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
23 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
24 commercially-available version of *The Eternal World* is included in a dataset used to train Meta’s
25 large language models, as that term is construed above. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks
26 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

27

28

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 95:

Admit that *Killfile* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in a dataset used to train Your large language models.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 95:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague, ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’ allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5. Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that the referenced work, *Killfile*, is not alleged to be at issue in this action.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 96:

Admit that *Flashmob* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in a dataset used to train Your large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 96:

Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague, ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’ allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5.

Meta further objects to this Request on the ground that it is unduly burdensome for Meta to determine whether the datasets used to train Meta’s large language models (as construed above) contain the entirety of the text of any particular book, and would require Meta to conduct an analysis

1 of a third party database that is equally accessible to Plaintiffs for every word of any particular
2 work. Meta further object to this Request to the extent that it presumes that the referenced author
3 in fact authored the referenced work—information that is outside of Meta’s possession, custody, or
4 control.

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: Based
6 on a reasonable investigation, Meta admits that substantially all of the text from a published and
7 commercially-available version of *Flashmob* is included in a dataset used to train Meta’s large
8 language models, as that term is construed above. Except as expressly admitted, Meta lacks
9 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of this request, and on that basis denies it.

10 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 97:**

11 Admit that *Deep State: A Nathaniel Cade Story* by Christopher Farnsworth was included in
12 a dataset used to train Your large language models.

13 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 97:**

14 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are
15 applicable to this Request. Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague,
16 ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to
17 the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not
18 publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’
19 allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models
20 within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama
21 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5. Meta further objects to this Request on
22 the ground that the referenced work, *Deep State: A Nathaniel Cade Story*, is not alleged to be at
23 issue in this action.

24 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 98:**

25 Admit that you used books sourced from Books3 to train one or more of your large language
26 models.

27 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 98:**

28 Meta incorporates by reference its Objections to Instructions and Definitions, which are

applicable to this Request. Meta objects to this Request and vague, ambiguous, and unintelligible, as written. It is not clear to Meta what it means to use “books sourced from Books3.” Meta further objects to the term “large language models” as vague, ambiguous, and undefined, as well as overbroad, and unduly burdensome, and disproportionate to the needs of the case to the extent that it purports to include large language models that were not publicly released and/or were not trained on corpuses of text that allegedly include any of Plaintiffs’ allegedly copyrighted works. Meta construes the term “large language models” to mean the models within the Llama family of LLMs that have been or are being developed by Meta, namely, Llama 1, Llama 2, Code Llama, Llama 3, Llama 4, and Llama 5.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Meta responds as follows: admitted.

Dated: January 17, 2025

COOLEY LLP

By: /s/Judd Lauter

Bobby Ghajar
Mark Weinstein
Kathleen Hartnett
Teresa Michaud
Judd Lauter
Liz Stameshkin
Colette Ghazarian

Full Counsel List

COOLEY LLP
PHILLIP MORTON (*pro hac vice*)
(pmorton@cooley.com)
COLE A. POPPELL (*pro hac vice*)
(cpoppell@cooley.com)
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004-2400
Telephone: (202) 842-7800

CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN &
HAMILTON LLP
Angela L. Dunning

Attorneys for Defendant
META PLATFORMS, INC.

COOLEY LLP
MATTHEW BRIGHAM (191428)
(mbrigham@cooley.com)
JUAN PABLO GONZALEZ (334470)
(jgonzalez@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000